

Date: Sat, 2 Jan 93 16:05:54 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #6
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sat, 2 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 6

Today's Topics:

430mhz band under th
Amiga Ham,etc users list
Internet / Packet Gateway
Ringo Ranger Mods?

Who do repeater coordinators represent? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 02 Jan 93 14:50:24 PST
From: swrinde!gatech!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!mala.bc.ca!oneb!ham!emd@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 430mhz band under th
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Rod Anderson) writes:

```
>
> In the 92-93 ARRL Repeater Directory the following are given as as
> the simplex frequencies on the ARRL band plan:
>
> 144.90-145.10
> 146.40-146.58 with a note that 146.40 may be a repeater input in some
> 147.42-147.57 places
>
> Of the above the 144.9-145.1 is in urban areas filled with packet
> activity.
>
```

> In some areas frequencies in the 147.42-147.57 range have been
> assigned a repeater inputs.
>
> I don't know what gives a repeater frequency coordinator the right to
> disregard the accepted national band plan and assign repeaters to
> simplex frequencies. After all they only speak for the repeater
> owners not the average users. Just think of how few closed repeaters
> there would be if all hams chose the repeater coordinators.
>

In many areas, repeater frequencies were assigned long before the national bandplan was devised. There were many repeaters on what are now considered "oddball" splits even before we had coordinators. When other repeaters came along, they filled up the spectrum and it became impossible to re-assign what was now an "oddball", even if they wanted to move. (And in many cases, oddball splits are chosen out of necessity - to move. (And in many cases, oddball splits are chosen out of necessity - to fit into a particular site, for example).

Even the ARRL recognizes variations in the national band plans. I quote, from the ARRL Repeater Directory:

"The ARRL supports regional frequency coordination efforts by amateur groups. Band plans published in the ARRL Repeater Directory are recommendations based on a consensus as to good operating practice on a nationwide basis. In some cases, however, local conditions may dictate a variation from the national bandplan. In these cases, the written determination of the regional frequency coordinating body shall prevail and be considered good operating practice in that region."

And in many cases, repeater coordination group memberships ARE open to any amateur, not just repeater owners. Lack of participation by individual amateurs in frequency coordination is far more a case of apathy on the part of repeater users than it is a nefarious plot by repeater owners.

> Rod Anderson N0NZO on ao-16 rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu
>

Robert Smits VE7EMD Ladysmith B.C.
Ph (604) 245-2553 e-mail: emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca
PACKET VE7EMD@VE7KIT.#VANC.BC.CAN.NA

Date: 2 Jan 93 13:39:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Amiga Ham,etc users list
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I am attempting to create a user list of amiga users. If you wish to be added to this list, send me e-mail to the above address. 73

Date: Sat, 02 Jan 93 09:44:05 MST
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!stat!david@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Internet / Packet Gateway
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

How to Use the WB7TPY
Packet <-> Internet Gateway

First, some brief operational notes:

- (1) Messages must not contain any foul language, or commercial purpose.
- (2) Messages can only be sent to countries that the United States has a third-party agreement. All others will be destroyed.
- (3) Messages from the internet should be less than 5K in length.
No files should be sent.
- (4) If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me either on
packet radio: WB7TPY@WB7TPY.AZ.USA.NA -or-
Internet : david@stat.com -or-
Fidonet : David Dodell @ 1:114/15
- (5) Have fun. Use the gateway as much as you like. That is what it is there for.

From Internet to Packet

Send mail to the internet address of:

gate@wb7tpy.ampr.org

The first line of text must contain a full packet address, proceeded with the word "Packet:"

For example, mail to my packet address, would have the first line of text;

Packet: wb7tpy@wb7tpy.az.usa.na

From Packet to Internet

Send as private mail (never a bulletin) to the packet address of:

gate@wb7tpy.az.usa.na

The first line of text must contain a full domained internet address,
proceeded with the word "Internet:"

For example, mail to my internet address, would have the first line of text;

Internet: david@stat.com

Internet: david@stat.com FAX: +1 (602) 451-1165
Bitnet: ATW1H@ASUACAD FidoNet=> 1:114/15
Amateur Packet ax25: wb7tpy@wb7tpy.az.usa.na

Date: 2 Jan 93 17:13:53 GMT
From: usc!rpi!newsserver.pixel.kodak.com!kodak!eastman!tornado!
jpp@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Ringo Ranger Mods?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Does anyone know if a 2-Meter Ringo Ranger antenna might be modified to be
used on 10-Meters. I have one on the roof but want to use it not for 2 but
for ten. Could it be shortened or lengthened to resonate at ten? Any ideas?

Thanks,
Joe,N2MSG

Date: Sat, 2 Jan 93 18:41:09 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Who do repeater coordinators represent?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

How valid is the claim of repeater owners right to exclusive use their
frequency. After all they claim that the repeater frequency

coordinators assigned the frequency to them. But do the repeater frequency coordinators represent the interests of the entire ham radio community or just the interests of the repeater owners.

It is important to recall that in many areas the repeater frequency coordinators have been appointed by the REPEATER owners. And they represent the REPEATER owners views and interests not those of the average ham or repeater user. The important thing to recall about frequency coordinators is they are more interested in making the repeater owners happy than the welfare of ham radio in general. To this end they have assigned as many frequencies to repeaters as they had available. In some cases they even assigned what are by the national band plan simplex frequencies as repeater input frequencies.

The local repeater coordinators have failed to save any frequencies for future use. It is suggested that the most effective form of packet radio is to have packet repeater. However in most areas there are no 2 m. frequencies available limiting this option

If repeater coordinators were chosen from ham radio in general rather than being creatures of the repeater owners there would be no problem with closed repeaters, there would be no members only closed repeaters on 2 m. The only real reason for a closed repeaters is to keep the jerks who insists that they have the right to use improper language, or harass other hams off the repeater.

Rod Anderson NONZO rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu

Date: Sat, 02 Jan 93 14:29:13 PST
From: swrinde!gatech!destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!mala.bc.ca!oneb!ham!emd@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Who do repeater coordinators represent?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Rod Anderson) writes:

>
>
> How valid is the claim of repeater owners right to exclusive use their
> frequency. After all they claim that the repeater frequency
> coordinators assigned the frequency to them. But do the repeater
> frequency coordinators represent the interests of the entire ham radio
> community or just the interests of the repeater owners.
>

It probably depends on your local situation. In some areas, coordinators

are elected, some are appointed, etc. Some coordinating bodies are open to membership from any ham, others may represent repeater operators, clubs, etc.

> It is important to recall that in many areas the repeater frequency
> coordinators have been appointed by the REPEATER owners. And the
> represent the REPEATER owners views and interests not those of the
> average ham or repeater user. The important thing to recall about
> frequency coordinators is they are more interested in making the
> repeater owners happy than the welfare of ham radio in general. To
> this end they have assigned as many frequencies to repeaters as they
> had available. In some cases they even assigned what are by the
> national band plan simplex frequencies as repeater input frequencies.
>

You may see something nefarious in this, I don't. Even in areas where coordination group membership IS open to any amateur, you rarely see anyone but representatives of repeater operators at coordination meetings. Why is this? Because repeater operators, in my experience, are almost the only hams interested in attending coordination meetings. After all, coordination policies directly affect them. Most hams can't be bothered to find out anything about coordination organizations or to attend meetings. And in many cases, repeaters were operating well BEFORE any national band plans had evolved. There are a number of local and regional band plan variations from national band plans, and even the ARRL recognizes this in the Repeater Directory.

> The local repeater coordinators have failed to save any frequencies
> for future use. It is suggested that the most effective form of
> packet radio is to have packet repeater. However in most areas there
> are no 2 m. frequencies available limiting this option
>

Well, it's hardly the coordinator's fault that 2M repeaters are popular, and that in many areas, all available repeater frequencies were assigned BEFORE Packet became popular. There are several possible solutions here.

1. Persuade some local group to "give-up" a voice repeater frequency so you can put up a packet repeater.
2. Try to get national bandplans to set aside spectrum for 2M duplex packet.
3. Try to get the FCC to relax the regs so that you can use the spectrum from 145.50 to 145.70 as repeater inputs (or outputs), pairing these frequencies with 144.9 to 145.10 so that you can use them as duplex packet frequencies. (We HAVE done this in B.C. where U.S. rules don't apply, and have for example, a wide coverage full duplex packet repeater - VE7LAN - on a 3,000 ft mountain in Vancouver on 145.67/07).

> If repeater coordinators were chosen from ham radio in general rather

> than being creatures of the repeater owners there would be no problem
> with closed repeaters, there would be no members only closed repeaters
> on 2 m. The only real reason for a closed repeaters is to keep the
> jerks who insists that they have the right to use improper language,
> or harass other hams off the repeater.

>

You've got to remember the history of how 'closed' systems came to be popular in some areas. In many cases, hams who wanted to experiment with technically sophisticated remote bases, linked systems, etc, were told to go to 440 to play because there was hardly anyone there, and because closed systems weren't wanted on 2M. So they did. Now, when the lower bands, and 440 are all full, other hams are seeing what they see as underutilized spectrum, and want to re-assign it. And they're going to have a hard time convincing those already there that they should vacate the spectrum they occupied 'cause no one else wanted it in the first place.

That said, I think this is a problem that ALL coordinating bodies are having to face - some sooner than others. When all the repeater spectrum is assigned, how do you fit in more repeaters? And when you figure it out technically, how do you force people already there to move, or acquire new equipment to allow the co-existence of one or more repeaters on the same channel? Or do you just say - sorry, there's no room left.

Coordinating bodies that impose such requirements on repeater operators WILL get sued. Coordinators are volunteers, and spend an enormous amount of time on what is essentially a thankless task. No coordinator is going to voluntarilly put himself in the way of a lawsuit that may wipe him, and his family, out financially. Thus coordinators usually operate on the first come, first served basis that allows them to avoid making any kind of comparative judgement of the worthiness of applicants for repeater spectrum.

And don't assume that the coordinators are the CAUSE of the policies that you don't like. It's extremely difficult to persuade anyone that they should give up something they've enjoyed for years (like exclusive access to a repeater pair). In many cases, the coordinators would be VERY willing to make changes in how repeater pairs are assigned, if only they could figure out how to get the amateur community interested enough in the idea to support them.

Some six years ago, when I was still the B.C. VHF coordinator, we did a study to determine how we could fit in more repeaters. We came to the conclusion that it was possible technically by monitoring all the channels to determine uage levels, requiring all repeaters to use PL access, to fit in quite a few more repeaters. It certainly wasn't possible politically, however, as users of all the existing repeaters made it impossible to pass such a motion. I still have the scars :-)

Please talk to your local coordinators if you are unhappy with methods used in your area. Find out when meetings are held, and attend. I'm sure they'll be happy to have informed assistance from anyone.

>

Robert Smits VE7EMD Ladysmith B.C.
Ph (604) 245-2553 e-mail: emd@ham.almanac.bc.ca
PACKET VE7EMD@VE7KIT.#VANC.BC.CAN.NA

Date: Sat, 02 Jan 93 20:03:08 GMT
From: enterpoop.mit.edu!mojo.eng.umd.edu!chuck@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1hm407INNqjn@network.ucsd.edu>, <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <8228@lib.tmc.edu>p
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1992Dec28.235602.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:
>Excuse Me ? "Invited" to use the spectrum. Where does the FCC say that ANY
>Amateur has to be INVITED to transmit on a frequency? This kind of attitude
>is a good part of What's wrong with ham radio today. Some people think they
>have a god given right to a portion of the spectrum. It's theirs - they
>paid for it - an no one's going to take it away from them. Pure unadulterated
>BULLSHIT.

In article <8228@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>This kind of attitude is a good part of What's wrong with ham radio today.
>Some people think they have a god given right to use other people's equipment.
>It's using ham spectrum and they can use it if they damned well please. Pure
>unadulterated BULLSHIT.

>

>Your argument boils down to "If they want to spend \$10K on a sophisticated
>repeater system, they have to make it a public utility". There are two

If you want to park your \$10K machine on a public frequency, then you should expect it to be used as a public utility. If you are not expecting that, then you should move out of the way so that others can use the frequency.

This "I own the frequency" crap IS the largest problem with Ham radio today. Nothing compels you to put up a repeater. You do so, in part out of public service, in part out technical interest, and in part out of stroking your own

ego. Nothing wrong with that. The rest of the Ham community puts up with your hogging of the frequency with your repeater because it expects to be able to use it from time to time when it wishes to, or needs to.

No one expects to use your autopatch for free; so control your access codes. If you find that someone spends a great deal of time on your machine, remind that person that it costs a lot of money to run a repeater, and you can use all the help you can get, but don't expect to be able to force that individual to pay. This is not a commercial venture. If you still can't deal with your "great act of charity", then take your repeater down, and let someone else use the allocation. There are plenty of hams out there who would love to put up an open repeater on your pair!

73,

Chuck Harris - WA3UQV
chuck@eng.umd.edu

Date: Sat, 2 Jan 93 18:55:45 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec29.161631.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <8245@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1992Dec31.123918.1@ttd.teradyne.com>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1992Dec31.123918.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:
>In article <8245@lib.tmc.edu>, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>> In article <1992Dec29.161631.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:
>>> That works both ways. In an area where there's extremely high frequency
>>>congestion, If a pair of simplex stations pick a repeater input on which to
>>>hold a simplex QSO (and the repeater's not in use at the time), any station
>>>knowingly transmitting on the input and QRMing their QSO is equally at fault.
>>
>> ...assuming that they can hear him. If the repeater is PLed, and they're not
>> using the repeater's PL tone, then someone using the repeater from across town
>> won't know that they're there. Nevertheless, if he gets into a conversation on
>> the repeater with someone else who, likewise, cannot hear the "simplex"
>> conversation, then the only interference going on is from the "simplex" users.
>
>That's why I said "knowingly".
>
>>
>>>The only thing the rules say is that the repeater operator can turn off the
>>>repeater to prevent the 'non members' from being repeated. The rules say
>>>nothing about giving the repeater operator(s) EXCLUSIVE rights to the

```

>>>frequencies, input or output. The spectrum is still a shared resource - it's
>>>first come first served.
>>
>> OK...but why should someone hold a "simplex" conversation on a frequency known
>> to be a repeater input? The only reason I can come up with is that they
>> deliberately wish to QRM the repeater, especially if they do not QSY after
>> being advised of the situation. Otherwise, they can accomplish the same thing
>> by using a repeater's OUTPUT frequency, and they thereby gain the advantage
>> that the repeater user is much more likely to hear them and avoid them.
>
>This happened to me some years ago. The repeater was 'co-ordinated' on
>non-standard frequencies. In my part of the country, the input (and output)
>frequencies were both simplex freqs. In California, these frequencies were
>a repeater with a non-standard split. My friend and I had been using the
>frequencies to co-ordinate a cross country car trip for 2000 miles with no
>problem.
>
>When we got into the L.A. Basin, some A**hole read us the riot act. He didn't
>bother to explain that it was a repeater freq, or ask us to move. He just
>blew his top about malicious interference on "HIS" frequency. I didn't need
>that attitude then and I don't need it now.
>
>>
>> It is simply not good amateur practice to hold a conversation on the
>> repeater's input frequency if you do not intend to use the repeater. Folks
>> have been held to be maliciously interfering with the users of the repeater
>> for doing so.
>
>It's also not "good amateur practice" to put repeaters on frequencies that
>are considered simplex channels in the rest of the world, either. I can
>understand it happening where spectrum is scarce, but if it's a 'so called'
>private repeater, and the operator won't have it published in a repeater
>directory so that you know it's there - the frequency is fair game..
>
>-----
>
> John Rice - K9IJ | "Did I say that ?" I must have, but It was
> rice@ttd.teradyne.com | MY opinion only, no one else's...Especially
> (708)-940-9000 - (work) | Not my Employer's.... Licensed since 1959
> (708)-438-5065 - (bbs ) | Ex: K8YZR, KH6GHC, WB9CSP, W9MMB, WA1TXV

```

In the 92-93 ARRL Repeater Directory the following are given as as
the simplex frequencies on the ARRL band plan:

144.90-145.10

146.40-146.58 with a note that 146.40 may be a repeater input in some

147.42-147.57 places

Of the above the 144.9-145.1 is in urban areas filled with packet activity.

In some areas frequencies in the 147.42-147.57 range have been assigned a repeater inputs.

I don't know what gives a repeater frequency coordinator the right to disregard the accepted national band plan and assign repeaters to simplex frequencies. After all they only speak for the repeater owners not the average users. Just think of how few closed repeaters there would be if all hams chose the repeater coordinators.

Rod Anderson N0NZO on ao-16 rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu

Date: Sat, 2 Jan 1993 19:47:32 GMT
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec29.161631.1@ttd.teradyne.com>, <8245@lib.tmc.edu>,
<1992Dec31.123918.1@ttd.teradyne.com>
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1992Dec31.123918.1@ttd.teradyne.com> rice@ttd.teradyne.com writes:
>

>This happened to me some years ago. The repeater was 'co-ordinated' on
>non-standard frequencies. In my part of the country, the input (and output)
>frequencies were both simplex freqs. In California, these frequencies were
>a repeater with a non-standard split. My friend and I had been using the
>frequencies to co-ordinate a cross country car trip for 2000 miles with no
>problem.

>
>When we got into the L.A. Basin, some A**hole read us the riot act. He didn't
>bother to explain that it was a repeater freq, or ask us to move. He just
>blew his top about malicious interference on "HIS" frequency. I didn't need
>that attitude then and I don't need it now.

>
And if he prevented you from completing your QSO, he was guilty of malicious interference. Period. A local repeater I use is co-channeled with one in San Diego. Interference is not normally a problem, but during late summer ducting some outlying users of that repeater are annoyed when they receive trans-missions from our local one (weather and topography conspire). One guy repeatedly gets on our repeater (using his beam) and politely informs users that they are using an "uncoordinated and illegal" repeater. So what, as I can choose to ignore him, right? Problem is, he will continue to break, over and over, politely repeating the same comment. He never transmits a carrier or tones or anything, but his persistence has made it difficult to continue a

QSO. I checked with a representative of the coordinating board, and he said that regardless of whether or not there is a legitimate interference issue, that guy is guilty of malicious interference if he prevents us from completing our QSO. I chose not to pursue it because the ducting is temporary and the problem goes away until next summer.

-grl.

Date: Sat, 2 Jan 1993 13:44:36 GMT
From: psinntp!sugar!jreese@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec31.150918.17046@ke4zv.uucp>, <C053IC.6H4@NeoSoft.com>,
<1993Jan1.150034.23723@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: 430 mhz band under th (now repeater costs)

In article <1993Jan1.150034.23723@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Not all closed systems have low activity, but are they making the
>most effective usage of the spectrum for the total user community
>when they prevent the majority of users from accessing the spectrum
>they occupy?

>

>I don't think that question can be answered yes because
>the same machine, if open, would serve a larger community of users.

Horse-hockey! I might accept this if my system were less active than any open system in town...but it isn't. If the radio is being used by someone, then that frequency is not wasted. It doesn't matter which political group that person belongs to. The fact is that the system is used, not just sitting there taking up a channel.

I don't get on the HF traffic nets because that activity doesn't interest me. Does that mean I should argue that they are "wasting" that frequency because their activity doesn't appeal to all amateurs??? I think not.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT	"Real Texans never refer to trouble
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com	as deep doo-doo" --Molly Ivins

Date: Sat, 2 Jan 1993 18:13:47 GMT
From: swrinde!gatech!concert!samba!usenet@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1992Dec30.062020.24365@ssc.com>, <1992Dec30.234200.11309@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Jan02.061145.6961@ssc.com>

Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

The solution to these problems or where and where not to transmit:

Get yourself a copy of the FCC Rule Book (from the ARRL or from the Govt Printing Office), read it, form your opinions, and do what you feel is good operating practice within the law. If you get screamed at for operating simplex on a repeater input (or output) frequency, apologize, tell the guy your opinion, and move to another frequency. Don't stay on the frequency and continue to piss the repeater users off, but do explain your position to them in a nice way (ie: "I was just passing through, was unaware of the presence of a repeater here, and realized that I wasn't causing harmful interference to the best of my knowledge since the frequency wasn't in use as far as I could tell, but I'd be happy to move to another freq. Thanks for your time.")).

-ks

New ham. Was all of this really that hard to figure out?

--

The opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the Campus Office for Information Technology, or the Experimental Bulletin Board Service.
internet: laUNCHpad.unc.edu or 152.2.22.80

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #6
